

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/053,929	01/22/2002	Julie Straub	ACU 109 CIP 7093	
23579 PATREA L. PA	7590 04/26/2007 ABST		EXAMINER	
PABST PATENT GROUP LLP			FUBARA, BLESSING M	
400 COLONY SQUARE, SUITE 1200 1201 PEACHTREE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANȚA, G	30361		1618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	04/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)			
10/053,929	STRAUB ET AL.	STRAUB ET AL.		
Examiner	A -4 11-14			
Examine	Art Unit			

	Blessing M. Fubara	1618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 06 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE D6.07(f).	g date of the final rejection E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co			00000
<ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
<ol><li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li></ol>	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi vided below or appended.	Il be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
<ul> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ul>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.  Other:			
			*

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Unger prepares the solid porous matrix by combining therapeutic agent, surfactant, solvent and blowing agent to form emulsion/suspension, upon drying either by spray drying of lyophilizing, the solvent and blowing agents are removed resulting in the formation of micro-cavities (paragraphs [0184]-[0190]); Unger dissolves dextromethasone and PEG in methanol in Example 1; the dissolved drug in methanol is a drug solution; methanol is a volatile organic solvent; step (b) was not mis-characterized because Unger combines pore forming agents such as PEG, bicarbonate (paragraph [0167] with the drug. Unger may not have disclosed the exact order of steps as recited in claim 16, (a) through (d), but Unger teaches the steps of dissolving the drug in volatile organic solvent in the presence of pore forming agents such as bicarbonate of PEG, lyophilizes or vacuum dries or spray dries the suspension or emulsion to form the porous matrix as is described in (paragraphs [0184]-[0190]). In the absence of factual showing, the recited order of steps of forming the porous composition is not inventive over the Unger method of forming porous composition.

Applicant's reference to original claims 1 and 23 of parent application 09/433,486 as providing support for 0.5 m2/ml in examined claim 16 is acknowledged.

(BF)

MICHAEL G. HARTLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER